arXiv:0711.0162v4 [math.LO] 4 Jul 2009

DEFINABLE DAVIES' THEOREM*

Asger Törnquist†, William Weiss

July 4, 2009

Abstract

We prove the following descriptive set-theoretic analogue of a Theorem of R.O. Davies: Every Σ^1_2 function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ can be represented as a sum of rectangular Σ^1_2 functions if and only if all reals are constructible.

§1. Introduction

In [1], R. O. Davies proved that the continuum hypothesis, CH, is equivalent to the statement that every function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ can be represented as a sum of "rectangular" functions as follows: There are $g_n, h_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $n \in \omega$, such that

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(x)h_n(y),$$

where at each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ there are at most finitely many non-zero terms in the above sum. We call such a representation a *Davies representation* of f. Thus Davies' Theorem says that CH is equivalent to that every function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ has Davies representation.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following descriptive set-theoretic analogue of Davies' Theorem:

*Mathematics subject classification 2000: 03E15.

†A. Törnquist was supported in part by the Danish Natural Sciences Research Council post-doctoral grant no. 272-06-0211

THEOREM 1. *Every Σ^1_2 function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ has a Davies representation*

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x, n)h(y, n),$$

where $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ are Σ^1_2 functions and the sum has only finitely many non-zero terms at each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, if and only if all reals are constructible.

We will also show that it is not possible to find a Davies representation of $f(x, y) = e^{xy}$ using Baire or Lebesgue measurable functions g and h. Note though that e^{xy} *does* have a representation as an infinite power series in x and y. We will give an example of a Borel (in fact, Δ^1_1) function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which does not admit a rectangular sum representation as above with Baire or Lebesgue measurable g and h, even if we drop the pointwise finiteness condition of the sum, and only ask that at each (x, y) the sum converges pointwise.

Organization: In §2 below we show (Theorem 2) that if there is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ then every Σ^1_n function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ admits a representation

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x, n)h(y, n),$$

with Σ^1_n functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$, and where the sum has only finitely many non-zero terms at each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

In §3 we establish the converse to Theorem 2 in the case of Σ^1_2 functions (Theorem 3). We also establish a converse in the Σ^1_3 case, under the additional assumption that there is a measurable cardinal. Finally, we establish the two facts regarding representations using Baire and Lebesgue measurable functions mentioned after Theorem 1 above.

§2. INDUCTIVE ARGUMENT

The necessary descriptive set-theoretic background for this paper can be found in [9] and [8], in particular the definitions of the (lightface) point-

classes Σ^1_n, Δ^1_n and Π^1_n. Here we recall the notions for Δ^1_n well-orderings that are the most important to us.

Following [2], we say that a Δ^1_n well-ordering $\prec$ of $\mathbb{R}$ is *strongly* Δ^1_n if it has length ω_1 and the following (equivalent) statements hold (c.f. [9] chapter 5):

1. If $P \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ is Σ^1_n then

$$R(x,y) \iff (\forall z \prec y) P(x,z)$$

   is Σ^1_n.

2. The initial segment relation $\mathrm{IS} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\leq \omega}$ defined by

$$\mathrm{IS}(x,y) \iff (\forall z \prec x)(\exists n) y(n) = z \wedge (\forall i,j) i = j \vee y(i) \neq y(j)$$

   is Σ^1_n.

If all reals are constructible then there is a strongly Δ^1_2 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$, see e.g. [6].

It will often be necessary to work with recursively presented Polish spaces other than $\mathbb{R}$, such as ω^ω or $\mathbb{R}^{\leq \omega}$ (see below). Since all uncountable recursively presented Polish spaces are isomorphic in the sense that there is a Δ^1_1 bijection between them with a Δ^1_1 inverse (see [9, 3E.7]), once we have a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ we have a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of all recursively presented Polish spaces. For convenience we will use the same symbol, usually $\prec$, for such a well-ordering in all the recursively presented spaces we consider. This minor ambiguity poses no real danger.

We will say that a function $f : X \to Y$ from one recursively presented Polish space X to another, Y, is Σ^1_n (respectively Π^1_n and Δ^1_n) if its graph is Σ^1_n (respectively Π^1_n and Δ^1_n). A function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to have a Σ^1_n *Davies representation* if there are Σ^1_n functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x,n) h(y,n)$$

and the sum has only finitely many non-zero terms at each (x,y). The notions of Π^1_n and Δ^1_n Davies representation are defined similarly.

THEOREM 2. *If there is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ then every Σ^1_n function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ has a Σ^1_n Davies representation. In particular, if all reals are constructible then every Σ^1_2 function has a Σ^1_2 Davies representation.*

To prove this, we will need to verify that Davies' proof, which uses Zorn's Lemma, produces functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ that are Σ^1_n and witness that f has a Σ^1_n Davies representation. This in turn requires that we produce Σ^1_n predicates (in the sense of [8, p. 3] or [6, p. 152–157]) that define g and h. These predicates will essentially be formulas defining g and h by transfinite recursion as in the usual proof of the transfinite recursion theorem, see e.g. [4, p. 22, (2.6)].

If X is a set, we write $X^{\leq\omega}$ for the set of functions $g : \alpha \to X$ for some $\alpha \in \omega + 1$, and we set $\mathrm{lh}(g) = |\operatorname{dom}(g)|$, the cardinality of $\operatorname{dom}(g)$. For $g \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ we let

$$\operatorname{supp}(g) = \{n \in \omega : n \in \operatorname{dom}(g) \wedge g(n) \neq 0\}.$$

It is convenient for the proof to work relative to a fixed countable sequence $x_n \in \mathscr{P}(\omega)$ of almost disjoint infinite subsets of ω. The sequence (x_n) will be used to make sure that certain almost disjoint families that are finite are not maximal, because they will be constructed so that they are almost disjoint from all x_n, $n \in \omega$. We will assume that the map $n \mapsto x_n$ is recursive.

Definition. The set $S \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^\omega)^{\leq\omega} \times (\mathbb{R}^\omega)^{\leq\omega}$ is defined by $(g, h) \in S$ if and only if

(a) The sets $\operatorname{supp}(g(k))$, $\operatorname{supp}(h(m))$ and x_n ($k \in \operatorname{dom}(g)$, $m \in \operatorname{dom}(h)$, $n \in \omega$) form an almost disjoint sequence of sets.

(b) For all $m \in \operatorname{dom}(g)$ there are infinitely many k such that $g(m)(k) = 1$.

(c) For all $n \in \operatorname{dom}(h)$ there are infinitely many k such that $h(n)(k) = 1$.

Note that S is Δ^1_1. We need the following Lemma to encode the inductive step.

2.1. Lemma. *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ is given and $(g,h) \in S$ is such that $\mathrm{lh}(h) = \mathrm{lh}(f)$. Then there is $\theta = \theta(f,g,h) : \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

(1) *For all $k \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$,*

$$f(k) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \theta(l)h(k)(l),$$

and the sum has only finitely many non-zero terms.

(2) *For all $n \in \mathrm{dom}(h)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta) \cap \mathrm{supp}(h(n))$ is finite.*

(3) *For all $n \in \mathrm{dom}(g)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g(n))$ is finite.*

(4) *For all $n \in \omega$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta) \cap x_n$ is finite.*

(5) *For infinitely many k we have $\theta(k) = 1$.*

Moreover, θ may be found recursively in the given data. In particular, there is a Δ^1_1 function $\theta : \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega} \times S \to \mathbb{R}^\omega$ such that $\theta(f,g,h)$ satisfies (1) – (5) *for all $(f,g,h) \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega} \times S$.*

Proof. We define by induction on $k \in \omega$ an increasing sequence $n_k \in \omega$ and $\theta \restriction n_k + 1$ such that

(1') For all $m \in \mathrm{dom}(f) \cap (k+1)$,

$$f(m) = \sum_{l=0}^{n_m} \theta(l)h(m)(l).$$

(2') For all $m \in \mathrm{dom}(h) \cap (k+1)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta \restriction n_k + 1) \cap \mathrm{supp}(h(m)) \subseteq n_m + 1$.

(3') For all $m \in \mathrm{dom}(g) \cap (k+1)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta \restriction n_k + 1) \cap \mathrm{supp}(g(m)) \subseteq n_m + 1$.

(4') For all $m \leq k$, $\mathrm{supp}(\theta \restriction n_k + 1) \cap x_m \subseteq n_m + 1$.

(5') $\theta(n_k) = 1$.

Assuming this can be done, θ will be defined on all of ω, since n_k is increasing; By (1') and (2') it follows that for $m \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$ we will have

$$f(m) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \theta(l)h(m)(l)$$

and by (2') it holds that $\theta(l)h(m)(l) = 0$ for $l > n_m$. Thus (1) and (2) of the statement of the Lemma holds. Finally, (3'), (4') and (5') ensures (3), (4) and (5).

To see that we can satisfy (1')–(5'), suppose n_k and $\theta \restriction n_k + 1$ have been defined.

Case 1: $k+1 \notin \mathrm{dom}(f)$. Then we let $p > n_k$ be the least number greater than n_k such that $p \notin \mathrm{supp}(g(m))$, $p \notin \mathrm{supp}(h(m))$ and $p \notin x_m$, for $m \leq k$. The number p exists because of condition (a) in the definition of S. Define $n_{k+1} = p$, and for $n_k < l < n_{k+1}$ let $\theta(l) = 0$, and $\theta(n_{k+1}) = 1$. Clearly conditions (1')–(5') are satisfied.

Case 2: $k+1 \in \mathrm{dom}(f)$. Then let $p > n_k$ be the least number greater than n_k such that $p \notin \mathrm{supp}(g(m))$, $p \notin \mathrm{supp}(h(m))$ and $p \notin x_m$, for $m \leq k$, and $h(k+1)(p) = 1$. The number p exists because of conditions (a) and (c) in the definition of S. We let $q > p$ be least such that $q \notin \mathrm{supp}(g(m))$, $q \notin \mathrm{supp}(h(m))$ and $q \notin x_m$, for $m \leq k+1$. Let $n_{k+1} = q$ and define for $n_k < l \leq n_{k+1}$,

$$\theta(l) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } l = q = n_{k+1}, \\ f(k+1) - \sum_{m=0}^{p-1} \theta(m)h(k+1)(m) & \text{if } l = p, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that (2')–(5') are satisfied. To see (1'), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{n_{k+1}} \theta(l)h(k+1)(l) &= \sum_{l=0}^{p} \theta(l)h(k+1)(l) \\ &= f(k+1) - \sum_{m=0}^{p-1} \theta(m)h(k+1)(m) + \sum_{l=0}^{p-1} \theta(l)h(k+1)(l) \\ &= f(k+1). \end{aligned}$$

This ends Case 2. It is clear from the construction that θ is recursive in the given data (f, g, h). Thus the map $(f, g, h) \mapsto \theta(f, g, h)$ is in particular Δ^1_1. $\square$

2.2. *Davies' argument as an inductive construction.* For the remainder of this section of the paper, θ will be the function defined in Lemma 2.1. Using this lemma one can now produce a Davies representation of $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by induction as follows: Assuming CH, fix a well-ordering $\prec$ of $\mathbb{R}$ of order type ω_1. Suppose $g, h : \{y \in \mathbb{R} : y \prec x\} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ have been defined such that $\forall y, z \prec x$,

$$f(y, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(y, n)h(z, n)$$

and that further if (w_m) is an enumeration of the initial segment $\{y : y \prec x\}$ then the functions

$$g_0(m)(n) = g(w_m, n) \text{ and } h_0(m)(n) = h(w_m, n)$$

satisfy that $(g_0, h_0) \in S$. Then if we let $f_0(m) = f(w_m, x)$ and define $g(x, n) = \theta(f_0, g_0, h_0)(n)$ then it is easy to check using Lemma 2.1 that for $y \prec x$,

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x, n)h(y, n).$$

If (w'_m) enumerates $\{y : y \preceq x\}$ and we let $f_1(m) = f(x, w'_m)$ and

$$g_1(n) = \begin{cases} \theta(f_0, g_0, h_0) & \text{if } w'_n = x \\ g_0(k) & \text{if } w'_n = w_k \end{cases}$$

then $(h_0, g_1) \in S$ and if we let $h(x, n) = \theta(f_1, h_0, g_1))(n)$, it is again easy to check using the previous Lemma that for all $y \preceq x$,

$$f(y, x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(y, n)h(x, n).$$

Finally,

$$g_1(m)(n) = g(w'_m, n) \text{ and } h_1(m)(n) = h(w'_m, n)$$

satisfy $(g_1, h_1) \in S$, thus allowing the induction to continue.

Our task is now to verify that if $\prec$ is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$, then the construction we have described may be carried out in such a way that if $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Σ^1_n, then the functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ will be Σ^1_n. This can be done since the strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering allows us to enumerate initial segments in a uniformly Δ^1_n way. However, in order to be able to write down Σ^1_n definitions of g and h we need a lemma which says that there is a Σ^1_n function which can correctly compute $g \restriction \{y : y \prec x\} \times \omega$ and $h \restriction \{y : y \prec x\} \times \omega$ for every x.

Before stating that lemma we introduce various functions and predicates. Fix a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering $\prec$ of $\mathbb{R}$ and let $\mathrm{IS} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ be the initial segment relation as defined at the beginning of this section. Define $\mathrm{IS}^* : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega}$ by

$$\mathrm{IS}^*(x) = y \iff \mathrm{IS}(x, y) \wedge (\forall z \prec y) \neg \mathrm{IS}(x, z).$$

Note that IS^* is Δ^1_n. We also define a partial function $\mathrm{IS}^\# : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ by

$$\mathrm{IS}^\#(x, y) = n \iff \mathrm{IS}^*(x)(n) = y.$$

Note that the graph of $\mathrm{IS}^\#$ is a Δ^1_n subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \omega$, and that if $y \prec x$ then $\mathrm{IS}^\#(x, y)$ computes the unique n which y corresponds to in the enumeration of the initial segment of x given by $\mathrm{IS}^*(x)$. Finally, we define

$$\mathrm{succ}(x) = y \iff (\forall z \prec y) z = x \vee z \prec x.$$

2.3. Lemma. *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be Σ^1_n and suppose there is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering $\prec$ of $\mathbb{R}$. Then there is a unique Σ^1_n function $F : \mathbb{R} \to (\mathbb{R}^\omega)^{\leq\omega} \times (\mathbb{R}^\omega)^{\leq\omega}$ satisfying $F(x) = (G, H)$ if and only if*

(1) $\mathrm{lh}(G) = \mathrm{lh}(H) = \mathrm{lh}(\mathrm{IS}^*(x))$ *and* $(G, H) \in S$.

(2) *If $z, z' \prec x$, $\mathrm{IS}^\#(x, z) = k$ and $\mathrm{IS}^\#(x, z') = k'$ then*

$$f(z, z') = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G(k)(n) H(k')(n).$$

(3) *For all $y \prec x$, if we let $w' = \mathrm{IS}^*(y)$, $w = \mathrm{IS}^*(x)$ and $f_0(k) = f(y, w'(k))$, and define for $k \in \mathrm{dom}(w')$,*

$$G'(k) = G(l) \iff w'(k) = w(l)$$

and

$$H'(k) = H(l) \iff w'(k) = w(l)$$

then $w(m) = y$ implies that

$$G(m) = \theta(f_0, G', H')$$

(4) *For all $y \prec x$, if we let $w' = \mathrm{IS}^*(y)$, $w'' = \mathrm{IS}^*(\mathrm{succ}(y))$, $w = \mathrm{IS}^*(x)$ and $f_1(k) = f(w''(k), y)$, and define for $k \in \mathrm{dom}(w'')$,*

$$G''(k) = G(l) \iff w''(k) = w(l)$$

and for $k \in \mathrm{dom}(w')$,

$$H'(k) = H(l) \iff w'(k) = w(l)$$

then $w(m) = y$ implies that

$$H(m) = \theta(f_1, H', G'')$$

Proof. Conditions (1)–(4) express *exactly* that for $y \prec x$, if we let

$$g(y, n) = G(\mathrm{IS}^{\#}(x, y))(n)$$

and

$$h(y, n) = H(\mathrm{IS}^{\#}(x, y))(n)$$

then g and h are the functions we have constructed at stage x in the inductive construction described in 2.2 above, if we at any stage during the induction use the enumeration of the initial segments given by the function IS^*. Thus F is unique and defined for all x. Finally we note that the conditions (1)–(4)

can be expressed using Σ^1_n predicates when f is a Σ^1_n function. For instance, (3) may be replaced by

$$(\forall y \prec x)(\exists w, w', f_0, G', H' \in \mathbb{R}^{\leq\omega})(w' = \mathrm{IS}^*(y) \wedge w = \mathrm{IS}^*(x) \wedge$$
$$\mathrm{lh}(f_0) = \mathrm{lh}(w') \wedge (\forall k \in \mathrm{dom}(w'))(f_0(k) = f(y, w'(k)) \wedge$$
$$(\forall l \in \mathrm{dom}(G))(G'(k) = G(l) \wedge H'(k) = H(l) \iff w'(k) = w(l)))$$
$$\wedge (\forall m \in \mathrm{dom}(w))(w(m) \neq y \vee G(m) = \theta(f_0, G', H'))).$$

Thus (1)–(4) gives a Σ^1_n definition of the graph of F, and so the function F is Σ^1_n. □

Proof of Theorem 2. If $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Σ^1_n and $\prec$ is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering, let F be as in the Lemma 2.3 and let $F(x) = (G(x), H(x))$ for all x. Then

$$g(x, n) = G(\mathrm{succ}(x))(\mathrm{IS}^{\#}(\mathrm{succ}(x), x))(n)$$

and

$$h(x, n) = H(\mathrm{succ}(x))(\mathrm{IS}^{\#}(\mathrm{succ}(x), x))(n).$$

define Σ^1_n functions that give us a Davies representation of f. □

Remark. If $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is Δ^1_n then conditions (1)–(4) define a Δ^1_n function F. Consequently, the functions g and h produced in the proof of Theorem 2 will be Δ^1_n. Therefore we have:

2.4. Corollary. *If there is a strongly Δ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$ then every Δ^1_n function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ has a Δ^1_n Davies representation.*

§3. A definable converse.

We now show the following converse to Theorem 2 for Σ^1_2 functions:

THEOREM 3. *If there are Σ^1_2 functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$e^{xy} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x,n)h(y,n)$$

with only finitely many non-zero terms at each (x, y) then there is a Σ^1_2 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Since by Mansfield's Theorem ([7], see also [4, 25.39]) the existence of a Σ^1_2 well-ordering or $\mathbb{R}$ is equivalent to that all reals are constructible, Theorem 3 together with Theorem 2 proves Theorem 1 as stated in the introduction. The proof requires several lemmata:

3.1. LEMMA. *Let $b_0, \ldots, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$ be distinct reals and $c_0, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j e^{xb_j}$$

has $n+1$ distinct roots if and only if $c_0 = \cdots = c_n = 0$.

Proof. By induction on n. If $f(x)$ has $n+1$ distinct roots then so does

$$g(x) = e^{-b_0 x} f(x).$$

Using Rolle's Theorem from calculus it follows that $g'(x)$ has n distinct roots, and so by the inductive hypothesis must be constant zero. Thus $f(x)$ is constant zero. □

3.2. LEMMA. *Let $a_0, \ldots, a_n$ and $b_0, \ldots, b_n$ be two distinct sequences of real numbers. Then there are no functions $g_l, h_l : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $l < n$, such that*

$$e^{a_i b_j} = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} g_l(a_i) h_l(b_j)$$

for all $0 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Proof. If so then we have the matrix identity

$$[e^{a_i b_j}] = \begin{bmatrix} g_0(a_0) & \cdots & g_{n-1}(a_0) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ g_0(a_n) & \cdots & g_{n-1}(a_n) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_0(b_0) & \cdots & h_0(b_n) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ h_{n-1}(b_0) & \cdots & h_{n-1}(b_n) \end{bmatrix}$$

and so $[e^{a_i b_j}]$ is a product of an $n+1 \times n$ and an $n \times n+1$ matrix. It follows that $\text{rank}([e^{a_i b_j}]) \leq n$, which contradicts the previous Lemma. □

3.3. Lemma. *Assume Σ^1_n uniformization holds and that there are Σ^1_n functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$e^{xy} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x,n)h(y,n)$$

with only finitely many non-zero terms at each (x,y). Suppose there is an uncountable Σ^1_n set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and a binary Σ^1_n relation $\prec$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $(A, \prec)$ is well-ordered. Then there is a Σ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Define

$$N(x,y) = k \iff g(x,k)h(y,k) \neq 0 \wedge (\forall l > k) g(x,l)h(y,l) = 0.$$

Clearly $N : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ is Σ^1_n. Also define $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \omega$ by

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x,n) \iff & (\exists a \in \mathbb{R}^\omega)(\forall i)(\forall j)(i = j \vee a(i) \neq a(j)) \wedge \\ & (\forall k)(a(k) \in A \wedge N(x, a(k)) = n) \end{aligned}$$

which is Σ^1_n. Let $Q^* : \mathbb{R} \to \omega$ be a Σ^1_n uniformization of Q. Note that Q^* is defined everywhere since A is uncountable.

Now define $R \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times [\mathbb{R}]^{<\omega}$, where $[\mathbb{R}]^{<\omega}$ denotes the set of finite subsets[1] of $\mathbb{R}$, by

$$R(x,s) \iff |s| = Q^*(x) + 2 \wedge (\forall y \in s)(y \in A \wedge N(x,y) = Q^*(x)).$$

Let $R^* : \mathbb{R} \to [\mathbb{R}]^{<\omega}$ be a Σ^1_n uniformization of R.

[1]Formally we let $[\mathbb{R}]^{<\omega} = \{s \in \mathbb{R}^{<\omega} : (\forall k < \text{lh}(s) - 1) s(k) < s(k+1)\}$, where $<$ is the usual linear ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. Note that for $s \in [\mathbb{R}]^{<\omega}$, the quantifiers $(\forall x \in s)$ and $(\exists x \in s)$ can be replaced by number quantifiers in hierarchy calculations.

CLAIM. R^* is finite-to-1.

Proof. Suppose not. Then there is some $s = \{b_0, \dots b_n\}$ such that $R^{*-1}(s)$ is infinite. Pick $a_0, \dots, a_n \in R^{*-1}(s)$ distinct. Note that since $R^*(b_i) = s$ we have $Q^*(b_i) = |s| - 2 = n - 1$. Thus

$$e^{a_i b_j} = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} g(a_i, l)h(b_j, l),$$

contradicting the previous Lemma. □

Let $\prec_{\text{lex}}$ be the lexicographic order on $[A]^{<\omega}$ that we obtain from the well-ordering $\prec$ of A. Then we define $<^*$ by

$$x <^* y \iff R^*(x) \prec_{\text{lex}} R^*(y) \vee (R^*(x) = R^*(y) \wedge x < y),$$

where $<$ is the usual linear ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. Since R^* is finite-to-1, $<^*$ is a Σ^1_n well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. □

3.4. LEMMA. *There are no Baire or Lebesgue measurable $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$e^{xy} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x, n)h(y, n)$$

where the sum has finitely many non-zero terms at each (x, y).

Proof. Suppose there are Baire measurable $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ representing e^{xy} as above. Then

$$N(x, y) = k \iff g(x, k)h(y, k) \neq 0 \wedge (\forall l > k)g(x, l)h(y, l) = 0.$$

is also Baire measurable. It follows that there is some n_0 such that

$$A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} : N(x, y) = n_0\}$$

is non-meagre and has the property of Baire. Thus we may find $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ open and non-empty such that A is comeagre in $U \times V$. By Kuratowski-Ulam's Theorem it follows that

$$\{x \in U : A_x \text{ is comeagre in } V\}$$

is comeagre in U. Hence we may pick distinct elements $a_0, \ldots, a_{n_0+1} \in U$ such that the section A_{a_i} is comeagre in V for all $i = 0, \ldots, n_0 + 1$. But then we can find distinct elements

$$b_0, \ldots, b_{n_0+1} \in \bigcap_{i=0}^{n_0+1} A_{a_i},$$

which gives us that for $0 \leq i, j \leq n_0 + 1$,

$$e^{a_i b_j} = \sum_{n=0}^{n_0} g(a_i, n)h(b_j, n),$$

contradicting Lemma 3.2.

The proof of the Lebesgue measurable case is similar. □

Proof of Theorem 3. Suppose we have Σ^1_2 functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ representing e^{xy}. By the previous Lemma, g and h cannot be Baire measurable, and so $L \cap \mathbb{R}$ cannot be countable by [4, 26.21]. But then we can apply Lemma 3.3 with $A = L \cap \mathbb{R}$ and $\prec$ the canonical Σ^1_2 well-ordering of $L \cap \mathbb{R}$ to get a Σ^1_2 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. □

Remark. Assume Σ^1_3 uniformization. Suppose there is a measurable cardinal and let U be a normal ultrafilter witnessing this. Then the tree representation for Σ^1_3 (see [6] p. 201, also [4, 32.14]) and [6, 15.10] gives us that if $\mathbb{R} \cap L[U]$ is countable then all Σ^1_3 functions have the property of Baire. Since by [11, 4.6] there is a Σ^1_3 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R} \cap L[U]$, the proof above then gives us that if there is a Σ^1_3 Davies representation of e^{xy} then there is a Σ^1_3 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$. In fact, we obtain the following stronger result:

3.5. Corollary. *Assume Σ^1_3 uniformization. Suppose there is a measurable cardinal and let U be a normal ultrafilter witnessing this. Then if there are Σ^1_3 functions $g, h : \mathbb{R} \times \omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$e^{xy} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g(x, n)h(y, n)$$

with only finitely many non-zero terms at each (x, y) then $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cap L[U]$ and so there is a strongly Δ^1_3 well-ordering of $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. By inspecting the proof of Lemma 3.3, there exists a finite-to-1 Σ^1_3 function $\theta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cap L[U]$. Since the relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$R(y,n) \iff (\exists x_1, \dots x_n) \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} \theta(x_i) = y \wedge \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x_i \neq x_j$$

is Σ^1_3, it is absolute for transitive models containing U. Suppose that there is $x_1 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus L[U]$ and let $y = \theta(x_1)$. If $n = |\theta^{-1}(y) \cap L[U]|$ then $R(y, n+1)$ holds in V. By absoluteness it holds in $L[U]$, contradicting that $n = |\theta^{-1}(y) \cap L[U]|$. Thus $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cap L[U]$ and by [11, 5.2] there is a Δ^1_3 wellordering of $\mathbb{R}$. □

In light of Theorem 3, it is natural to ask the following:

Question 1. If there are Σ^1_2-functions g_n, h_n, $n \in \omega$ such that

$$e^{xy} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(x) h_n(y)$$

with the sum having only finitely many non-zero terms at each (x, y), does the conclusion of Theorem 3 still hold? That is, is it is necessary in Theorem 3 that g_n, h_n are Σ^1_2 uniformly in n?

In the paper [10], Shelah shows that the converse in Davies' original Theorem does not remain true if we drop the assumption that the sum must have at most finitely many non-zero terms and only require the sum to converge pointwise. In a similar vein we ask:

Question 2. If we drop the finiteness condition, does Theorem 1 still hold?

Shelah also shows in [10] that if we add $\aleph_2$ Cohen reals then there is a function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ which does not allow a representation

$$f(x,y) = \sum_{n}^{\infty} g_n(x) h_n(y),$$

even when we allow for the sum to have infinitely many non-zero terms, requiring only that it converges pointwise. As a counterpoint to that result, we point out the following:

THEOREM 4. *There is a Borel function $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for no $g_n, h_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ that are Baire measurable do we have*

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(x) h_n(y),$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where the sum converges point-wise, but may have infinitely many non-zero terms. The same holds if we replace Baire measurable by Lebesgue measurable.

Proof. Let as usual E_0 denote the equivalence relation on 2^ω defined by

$$xE_0y \iff (\exists N)(\forall n \geq N)x(n) = y(n).$$

Let $\mathbf{1}_{E_0}$ be the characteristic function of E_0. Suppose now that there are Baire measurable $g_n, h_n : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbf{1}_{E_0}(x, y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(x) h_n(y).$$

Then we can find a dense G_δ set A on which on which all the functions g_n and h_n are continuous. But then for $x, y \in A$ we have

$$xE_0y \iff (\forall k)(\exists N \geq k) \sum_{n=0}^{N} g_n(x) h_n(y) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

This gives us a G_δ definition of E_0 on A, and hence E_0 must be a smooth equivalence relation on A by [3], Corollary 1.2. But E_0 is not smooth on any comeagre set, and we have a contradiction.

The proof of the Lebesgue measurable case is similar. □

Remark. By [5] (see also [4, Exercise 26.2]), if there is a Cohen real (respectively random real) over L in V, then all Δ^1_2 functions are Baire measurable (respectively Lebesgue measurable). Thus it follows that in this setting, $\mathbf{1}_{E_0}$ cannot be represented as an infinite pointwise convergent sum of rectangular Δ^1_2 functions.

References

[1] R. O. Davies, *Representation of functions of two variables as sums of rectangular functions I*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, pp. 177-183 (1974).

[2] L. Harrington, Π^1_2 *sets and* Π^1_2 *singletons*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 52, No. 1. (Oct., 1975), pp. 356–360.

[3] L. Harrington, A. Kechris, A. Louveau, *A Glimm-Efross dichotomy for Borel equivalence relations*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 3 (4) (1990), pp. 903–928.

[4] T. Jech, *Set Theory*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (2003).

[5] H. Judah, S. Shelah, Δ^1_2*-sets of reals*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 42 (3), pp. 207–223, (1989).

[6] A. Kanamori, *The higher infinite*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (1997).

[7] R. Mansfield, *The non-existence of* Σ^1_2 *well-orderings of the Cantor set*, Fundamenta Mathematicae, 86 (3), pp. 279–282, (1985).

[8] R. Mansfield, G. Weitkamp, *Recursive aspects of descriptive set theory*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1985).

[9] Y. N. Moschovakis, *Descriptive set theory*, North Holland, (1980).

[10] S. Shelah, *On Ciesielskis Problems*, Journal of Applied Analysis, 3(2) pp. 191-209, (1997).

[11] J.H. Silver, *Measurable cardinals and* Δ^1_3 *well-orderings*, Annals of Mathematics, (2) 94 (1971), pp. 414–446.

Kurt Gödel Research Center, University of Vienna
Währinger Strasse 25, 1090 Vienna, Austria
E-mail: asger@logic.univie.ac.at

Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto
40 St. George Street, Room 6092, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
E-mail: weiss@math.utoronto.ca